

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action dated November 16, 2004.

The Examiner objected to claim 2 because it contained two steps, both labeled (a). Claim 2 has been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-13, 16, and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, contending that the specification does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to use statistical data from a full resolution scan of an original document to calculate the boundaries and dimensions of the original, and does not enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to locate a boundary from a scanned pixel.. The applicant respectfully contends that the specification contains sufficient disclosure to enable such calculations in the Background of the Invention paragraph 3 on pp. 1-2, and the Detailed Description at p. 5 lines 3-24 and p. 6 line 3 to p. 7 line 10. The applicant further notes that such statistical methods are well known in the art, as evidenced by the very references cited by the Examiner in the present office action. *See, e.g.* Gusmano at col. 3 lines 35-45 (stating that the use of statistics from a low resolution pre-scan to obtain boundary and size information about an original are well known in the art); *also see* Furoya at col. 3 and 4. The Examiner's rejection is therefore improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Son, U.S. Patent No. 6,005,693. The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rourke, U.S. Patent No. 5,191,429. Claims 1, 2, 14, and 15 have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gusmano, U.S. Patent No. 5,796,877. Gusmano discloses a copy machine that, like those discussed in applicant's Background of the Invention section, use a low-resolution prescan to obtain statistics from which the boundaries and size of an original image may be calculated. The method disclosed by Gusmano then makes a separate full resolution scan to obtain the necessary pixel information to produce a quality copy of the original. Independent claim 5, as amended, includes the limitations of "performing a first scan of said original at a full resolution to convert said original to a plurality of scan data . . . calculating at least one of a magnification

and a reduction of said original . . . using only said plurality of scan data from said first scan and . . . printing said copy from said scan data at one of said calculated magnification and reduction using said plurality of scan data from said first scan.” Gusnamo does not disclose these limitations because separate scans are used to “calculate at least one of a magnification and reduction of said original” and to print the copy of the original. Therefore independent claim 5 is distinguished over Gusnamo and should be allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 16, 18, 19, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Rourke and Son. Son discloses a copy machine in which a scan is first taken of the background over which an original will be moved during a full-resolution scan of that original. The background scan is used to determine the luminance gradient that signifies a boundary of the original from the full resolution scan. Thus Son, though calculating the boundaries and dimensions of an original document from a full resolution scan, still requires a preliminary scan of background material in order to make such calculations. Rourke discloses a copy machine that takes a first full resolution scan of a small original and presents a visual representation of the scan to a user who may then manually adjust the boundaries of a subsequent full resolution scan to focus on the portion of the copying surface supporting the original. Thus Rourke, also, requires two scans to both resize and duplicate an original document.

Claims 16-18 have been canceled. Independent claim 19 includes the limitations of performing a first scan to convert . . . said original to scan data . . . locating a boundary of said original from at least one of said detected pixels of at least one of said lines of scanned pixels using only said plurality of scan data from said first scan . . . calculating a size of said original image from said location of said boundary using only said plurality of scan data from said first scan . . . calculating a multiple of said size that will not exceed a dimension of a selected copy medium using only said plurality of scan data from said first scan and printing from said scan data a plurality of copies of said original equal to said multiple using said plurality of scan data from said first scan.” These limitations are not disclosed by the cited combination, which both require that data from an earlier scan be used when resizing and

Appl. No. 09/823,457
Amdt. dated April 18, 2005
Reply to Office action of November 16, 2004

copying an original. Therefore, claims 19, 20, and 22 each patentably distinguish over the cited combination and should be allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Son and Rourke, and in further view of Furoya. Son and Rourke have been previously discussed. Furoya describes a copy machine in which, like Gusanamo, uses a low-resolution prescan to obtain statistics from which the boundaries and size of an original image may be calculated. The method disclosed by Furoya then makes a separate full resolution scan to obtain the necessary pixel information to produce a quality copy of the original. Thus claim 21 is distinguished over the cited combination for the same reasons that claim 19, from which it depends, is distinguished over the combination of Son and Rourke.

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 6, 7-13, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of various combinations of Son, Rourke, Furoya, and Gusanamo, each of which has been previously discussed. Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled. The remaining claims, as amended, are distinguished over the respective cited combinations because each of these references require calculations from two scans in order to produce a re-sized copy of an original document. Each of these claims are therefore distinguished over the cited combinations and should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 5-13 and 19-22.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631